

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.unpto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/655,422	09/04/2003	Sandeep Chennakeshu	9314-16	6705	
54414 MYERS BIGE	7590 05/29/200 EL SIBLEY & SAJOVE	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 37428			MONTOYA, OSCHTA I		
RALEIGH, N	27627	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2623		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/29/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/655,422	CHENNAKESHU, SANDEEP		
Examiner	Art Unit		
OSCHTA MONTOYA	2623		

	OSCHTA MONTOYA	2623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 05 May 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	ICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
 Me reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must imely file one of the following i application in condition or allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing 	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (i)	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of exhauster of the control of the	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NO) v);	E below);	
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or 	er form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, i	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving the company of the compa		be entered and an ex	planation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	hefore or on the date of fling a ble	tion of Annualill not	he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
See Continuation Sheet.			
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other: 	P10/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Christopher Grant/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623			

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument (page 2-6) that the Bluetooth protocol teaches automatically forming a network as opposed to automatically initiating transmitting generated information for display, the examiner respectfully disagrees since it is well known in the art the use of Bluetooth protocol between devices within range to establish a connection and to transfer data, in this case the data will be the video signal (see Erasala/Yen reference submitted by applicant, section 2.2, 2nd paragraph).

In response to applicant's argument (page 6) that Motoyama fails "to teach or suggest automatically generating and providing a video signal to a video screen responsive to determining that information is being received from a handheld electronic device" applicant should note that Motoyama was brought in to teach providing an alternative video (Cot. 3. lines 55-63).

In response to applicant's argument (page 7-8) that nothing in Magnuson teaches a beacon that allows a determination if a device is within range, applicant should note that the use of beacons is to determine if a device is within range, also Magnuson teaches that if not code (beacon) is received it is beacuse the device is out of range (Col. 4, lines 55-65).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can not be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior at to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 935 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Liu teaches two electronic devices trying to connect in order to transfer data and Margunot teaches the use of beacons to check if the electronic devices are within range; therefore, the motivation will be to make sure the devices are within range in order to establish the connections.